

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 4-15, 30, 34-36, and 38-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Further, claims 7, 37, and 45-47 are indicated as allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 13-15, 34, 38-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,859,711 (“Barry”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,992 (“Gyllenskog”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a printer that can manage jobs based on identification information. In particular, a series of print job data that includes multiple print jobs in succession is received via a RAW-mode physical channel. Each print job is extracted based on a start-end pattern and an end-edge pattern to obtain an accepted job. Specifically, the data between the start-end pattern and the end-pattern constitute a single complete print job. Accordingly, the data is grouped into an accepted job. Next, the accepted print job is then managed to generate a managed job. From the managed print job, image data is generated. Finally, the print job is printed. Accordingly, the order, as specified by the claims of present invention, requires that the print job is extracted, and from the extracted print job an image is generated.

Turning to the rejection, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim

limitations.” (See MPEP §2143.03). Further, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (See MPEP §2143.03).

The Examiner asserts that Barry teaches extracting a print job, wherein extracting the print job comprises accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into the accepted job. However, the portion of Barry upon which the Examiner relies teaches only extracting individual pages rather than the entire print job. (See Office Action dated October 24, 3006, p.2). Specifically, Barry only teaches that the string of digits in a code is for an end of page rather than for the end or beginning of the print job as required by the present invention. (See, e.g., Barry col. 4, ll. 43-50). In fact, nowhere in Barry is a start end pattern and an end edge pattern used to extract print jobs. Accordingly, Barry may not be used to teach or suggest accepting data in a series of reception data from a start-end pattern to an end-edge patter to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into an accepted job.

Moreover, in contrast to the present invention which requires that the print job is extracted and then an image is generated, Barry teaches generating the image data before extracting the page-based jobs to several print engines. Specifically, Barry teaches performing a RIP operation to create rasterized images of a print job. Only after creating the rasterized images, Barry extracts from the rasterized images multiple page based jobs for each printer engine. (See, e.g., Barry col. 2, ll. 54-56, col. 14 ll. 48 – col. 15, ll. 57, and Figures 12 and 13). Thus, because Barry only teaches generating the image before extracting a print job, Barry does not teach generating image data on the basis of the managed job which is created by first extracting the print job.

Moreover, Gyllenskog does not teach that which Barry lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Gyllenskog is only relied upon to teach a RAW-mode physical channel for

communicating data in series and that the RAW Mode is a serial interface, a parallel interface, and/or a USB interface. (See Office Action dated October 24, 2006, page 3).

In view of the above, it is clear that neither Barry nor Gyllenskog whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 4, 8, 9, 13-15, 34, 38-44 which depend from claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 30, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry in view of Gyllenskog in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,747 ("Reilly"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As shown above, neither Barry nor Gyllenskog teaches that extracting the print job comprises: accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into the accepted job, or teaches extracting the print job before generating image data. Further, Reilly does not teach that which Barry and Gyllenskog lack. This is evidenced by the fact that Reilly is only relied upon to teach page description language and a specified language kind. (See Office Action dated October 24, 2006, page 5 and 6).

In view of the above, it is clear that Barry, Gyllenskog and Reilly, whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of claim 5, 6, 30, 35, and 36. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry in view of Gyllenskog in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,181,436 ("Kurachi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As shown above, neither Barry nor Gyllenskog teaches that extracting the print job comprises: accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into the

accepted job. Further, Kurachi does not teach that which Barry and Gyllenskog lack. Specifically, Kurachi is completely silent with respect to start-end patterns and end edge pattern. Thus, Kurachi may not be used to teach accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into the accepted job.


In view of the above, it is clear that Barry, Gyllenskog, and Kurachi, whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of claim 10-12. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places the present application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783/018001).

Dated: December 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant